



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,244	04/14/2004	Michael Sattlegger	785-011767-US (PAR)	6432

7590 12/14/2004
Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.
PERMAN & GREEN, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824

EXAMINER

KIFLE, BRUCK

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,244

Applicant(s)

SATTLEGGER ET AL.

Examiner

Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/14/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1624

Claim 38 is missing. Claims 39 and 40 are renumbered 38 and 39, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- i) The phrase “substituted benzo[b]azepin-2-one compounds of formulae I and II and in each case the tautomers thereof” is confusing as to the substituents or whether additional substituents are intended. The term “compound” is suggested because the structural formula and the definitions of the variables fully defines the claimed compound. Thus, “A compound of formula I or II” is suggested.
- ii) The term “residue” through out the claims is indefinite. The metes and bounds of a residue are not known. See for example the definition of R^5 as a linear or branched, saturated or unsaturated aliphatic C_{10} residue.” Is only a linear or branched, saturated or unsaturated alkyl group is intended or is more intended?
- iii) The formation of additional fused and bridged rings formed by R^1 - R^4 is confusing. If, say, R^1 and R^4 are both cyclohexyl, are these then supposed to be linked by oxygen? How is such a compound made? (Paragraph 1)
- iv) The definition of R^6 is unclear. First the phrase “a residue of the formula $-CH_2-NR^7_2$ ” should be rewritten as “a group of the formula $-CH_2-NR^7_2$ ” or simply $-CH_2-NR^7_2$. The two residues are not known. There is only one R^6 group present. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 1624

v) The term “heteroaryl” is indefinite because it is not known how many atoms are present, how many and what kind of heteroatoms are involved, what size ring is intended and how many rings are present.

vi) In the ring structures of “X” the group Z is present which is defined as “at least one optionally present oxygen, sulfur or nitrogen as a ring atom.” It is unclear how this is possible because the rings drawn are phenyl rings for which a carbon atom could not be replaced by sulfur or oxygen.

vii) The last paragraph of claim 1 is not proper Markush language and uses the phrase “in particular” several times. A proper Markush language links all of the alternatives using “or.” The phrase “in particular” renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

viii) In claims 2-12, replacing “Substituted benzo[b]azepin-2-one compounds and in each case the tautomers thereof according to claim 1” with “A compound according to claim 1” is suggested.

Claims 38 and 39 provide for the use of a compound, but, since the claims do not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for

Art Unit: 1624

example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Applicant is advised that should claim 12 be found allowable, claims 13-37 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claims 12-37 are duplicates of each other. Claims 13-37 are duplicates as they each depend on claim 12. Different intended uses are given no material weight in such claims. Note *In re Tuominen* 213 USPQ 89.

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention. The specification is not adequately enabling for the scope of the compounds claimed. There are only four compounds made and they all fall under formula II. This does not give a reasonable assurance that all, or substantially all of the compounds that could be made are useful. The claims are not drawn in terms of a recognized genus but are directed to a more or less artificial selection of compounds.

There is no reason why a claim drawn in this way should not be limited to those compounds which are shown to be useful. An Applicant is not entitled to a claim for a large

Art Unit: 1624

group of compounds merely on the basis of a showing that a selected few are useful and a general suggestion of a similar utility in the others.

Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

Also, see *In re Surrey* 151 USPQ 724, regarding sufficiency of a disclosure for a Markush group, and MPEP 2164.03 for enablement requirements in cases directed to structure-sensitive arts such as the instant pharmaceutical arts. Note in *Surrey*, in which testing done on a group of homogeneous compounds having the same core was deemed NOT sufficient to support claims to various hetero groups of a much narrower range than is being claimed herein and located at only one position in the formula. The instant scope is enormous; in the billions of compounds. Therefore, four compounds within its scope are not remotely representative of such a scope. See MPEP 2164.03.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bruck Kifle, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0668. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesdays to Fridays between 8:30 AM and 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund J. Shah can be reached on 571-272-0674. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Bruck Kifle, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

BK
December 10, 2004